

REMARKS

Claim 7 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10 remain in the application. Reconsideration and reexamination is respectfully requested.

In paper 3, the drawings were objected to for lack of a flow diagram for method claims. Applicant respectfully traverses. Figures are not required for method claims. See MPEP 601.01(f).

In paper 3, claims 1-5, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,907,742 (Johnson *et al.*). Applicant respectfully traverses. Note that Johnson *et al.* was cited by the applicant in an IDS at the time of filing this application, and is discussed in the background section of the application.

Claim 1 specifies: calibrating a final gain for the photosensor, after obtaining the image data; and using the initial gain and the final gain to modify the image data from the photosensor.

Johnson *et al.* do not teach or suggest calibrating a final gain after obtaining image data and using the initial gain and the final gain to modify the image data from the photosensor. The examiner cites column 3, line 62 through column 4, line 39. There is nothing in the cited text about calibrating a final gain after obtaining image data and using the initial gain and the final gain to modify the image data from the photosensor.

Claim 7 specifies; a platen for receiving an image to be scanned, the platen having a first end, and a second end opposite the first end, wherein a direction of scanning is from the first end to the second end; a first calibration strip, near the first end; and a second calibration strip, near the second end.

Johnson *et al.* do not teach or suggest a second calibration strip near the second end. The examiner cites column 3, lines 40-57. The cited text describes a calibration strip 124 (figure 2A) corresponding to the first calibration strip of claim 7, and servo strip 130 along the longitudinal edge 122B, which is not near the second end as defined in claim 7. In addition, claim 7 has been amended to specify that the second calibration strip is substantially parallel to the second end, further distinguishing over servo strip 130 of Johnson *et al.*

Claim 8, dependent on claim 7, specifies a third calibration strip, along a side connecting the first end to the second end. The third calibration strip corresponds to region 128 on servo strip 130 of Johnson *et al.* The examiner cites Johnson *et al.*, 124, 130 and region 128. Region 128 is not a separate calibration strip or servo strip, but rather is just the region of calibration strip 130 being viewed by sensor light monitor window pixels (column 3, lines 47-49 and lines 53-57; column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 1; column 8, lines 7-21). In particular, none of calibration strip 124, servo strip 130, or region 128 corresponds to the second calibration strip of claim 7.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. This application is considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by A. W. Winfield
Augustus W. Winfield
Reg. No. 34,046

December 20, 2004

Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

(970)-898-3142